

Appln. No. 09/863,199  
Amendment & Response to Final Office Action filed 3/1/06  
replying to Final Office Action of Nov. 15, 2005

PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 07451.0034-00000  
Intertrust Ref. No. IT-36.1 (US)

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed November 15, 2005 ("the Office Action"), Applicants respectfully propose that this application be amended as set forth above and that the Examiner consider the following remarks. By this response, claims 1-4, 6-14, and 17 are amended and claims 18-20 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. After entry of this paper, claims 1-17 will be pending in this application.

The Applicants thank Examiner Truong for the helpful comments and courtesies she extended to the Applicants' representatives, Mr. McDow and Mr. Lentini, in the telephonic interview of February 22, 2006, wherein bases for distinguishing claims 1-17 from the cited references were discussed.<sup>1</sup> The Applicants understand that the Examiner would accept and consider this Amendment After Final Office Action in view of that discussion.

In the instant Final Office Action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,754,829 to Butt et al. ("Butt") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,958,050 to Griffin et al. ("Griffin"). These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following remarks.

**Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butt in view of Griffin. The rejections are traversed respectfully in view of the following remarks.

---

<sup>1</sup> This interview summary is in accord with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), and thus no further written statement regarding this call is believed necessary at this time.

Appn. No. 09/863,199  
Amendment & Response to Final Office Action filed 3/1/06  
replying to Final Office Action of Nov. 15, 2005

PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 07451.0034-00000  
Intertrust Ref. No. IT-36.1 (US)

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, fails to show or suggest the novel combination of determining an authorization for a request to access computer resources using a fixpoint calculation made over a lattice of monotone authorization values as recited in the pending claims.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the above-enumerated rejections over the cited art and place this application in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-17 in condition for allowance. In view of the telephonic discussions with the Examiner, Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 1-4, 6-14, and 17 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Appln. No. 09/863,199  
Amendment & Response to Final Office Action filed 3/1/06  
replying to Final Office Action of Nov. 15, 2005

PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Attorney Docket No. 07451.0034-00000  
Intertrust Ref. No. IT-36.1 (US)

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 1, 2006

By:

  
Andrew B. Schwaab  
Reg. No. 38,611

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow  
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.  
901 New York Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 408-4000